

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME I

JANUARY, 1906

NUMBER 2

Editorials

PRESIDENT JAMES'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

One of the most important events in the educational world last fall was the installation of Dr. Edmund Janes James as president of the University of Illinois, and one of the most noticeable features of the ceremony was Dr. James's inaugural address. His subject was "The Function of the State University." Dr. James has had a distinguished career as professor and president. He is one of the men whose opinions on educational questions are considered. He is able, strenuous, and aggressive, and it goes without saying that the institution under his charge will go far in the direction in which he chooses to guide it.

With many of the sentiments of his address practically everyone who is interested in higher education in the Middle West will agree. "I take it first of all," he said, "that this institution is to be and become in an ever truer sense a university. That, I presume, has been settled once for all by the people of this state." And again: "It has been settled by the ever-increasing purpose of the great mass of the people to build here a monument which will be to them and their children an honor and glory forever, an evidence, which all the world can see and understand, of their corporate appreciation of the things of the spirit." This is excellent. But when we come to Dr. James's definition of the function of the state university, the honor and glory, which a moment before shone so brightly, assume a more sober, even a drab aspect. For in his opinion the state university is "sup-

plementary to the great system of higher education which private beneficence and church activity have reared. It is corrective rather than directive, co-operative rather than monopolistic." And it further transpires that the lines along which the University of Illinois may be expected to show the greatest development are those which are in closest contact with material progress. We hear of the school of agriculture, the school of engineering, of a projected college of commerce and administration, of the state water survey, the state natural history survey, the state entomologist's office, the state geological survey, etc., etc. But of humanistic studies there is scarcely a word! In what way does this imposing list of public utilities contribute to the "things of the spirit," at the mention of which all good humanists in Dr. James's audience must have pricked up their ears?

Dr. James's position is open to criticism on two sides. In the first place, many people will protest against the proposed limitations of the activities of the institution. If these limitations were dictated by the exigencies of the budget, the case would be wholly different. But the address contains a most cheerful account of the budget. It would seem to be Dr. James's deliberate policy to pay but little attention to certain branches, the importance of which he cannot but realize, because he thinks that they are taken care of in other institutions in the state. The assumption is that every student who attends the University of Illinois could, if he cared to do so, go elsewhere. But this is very far from being true. Geographical convenience, low fees, and other considerations of a similar nature are often the determining factors in a student's attending this or that institution. Hundreds of students must come and go at the University of Illinois whose interest in the state water supply is of the very mildest character—who perhaps are misguided enough to think that they see in the study of literature or of philosophy something more akin to the "things of the spirit" than they can find in the state geological survey. Even Dr. James will not claim that it will be balm to their souls to know that courses of the kind they want are offered somewhere else in the state.

In the second place, assuming that a majority of the students who come to the state university are primarily interested in applied science, is the sort of training provided the best for their development?

Admitting that it develops the scientist in the man, it may reasonably be asked: What becomes of the man in the scientist? Dr. James has said some pretty things about the part which the state university can play in raising the standard of citizenship through the influence of the graduates whom it turns back into the world each year. Surely he can not think that that man makes the best citizen whose university training has been conducted solely along the lines of professional efficiency. The student of the classics, of literature in general, or of philosophy cuts a sorry figure if he is wholly ignorant of science; but his plight is not so sad as that of the scientist to whom literature and philosophy are as closed books. Even in highly specialized scientific training the aim should be not so much to produce specialists who are men as men who are specialists.

M. INGRES ON THE VALUE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

It is surprising that the introduction of successive editions of so good a book as Professor Maxime Ingres' *Cours complet de langue française* should be disfigured by a gratuitous assault upon classical studies. Professor Ingres has a wide reputation as a teacher, and is said to know French as only a Frenchman can know it. But why should he put himself on record in such a diatribe as this? Classical teachers, however, while deploring the attitude of mind which regards depreciation of other courses as necessary to the appreciation of one's own, will on the whole be extremely grateful to M. Ingres for having, by his peculiar method of argument, added to the gayety of nations.

He begins by stating that the "hierophants of Greek and Latin" base their case upon three arguments: (1) that the study of Greek and Latin affords the best mental drill; (2) that it contributes to exact knowledge of one's mother-tongue; and (3) that intercourse with the ancients "forms the mind and heart." As a mere preliminary to his attack upon these three positions M. Ingres disposes of Greek, giving all Hellenic culture its quietus in one or two sentences. "Greek," he says, "is out of the question, for the simple reason that nobody ever learns it. Any college graduate will serve as a proof." He then proceeds to the annihilation of Latin under the three heads given. So far as the value of the drill is concerned, he says that "flexions, declensions, and conjugations constitute a formidable bar-

rier," and "the substance is so deeply buried beneath the form that all the energies of an average student are wanted in the arduous work of clearing." M. Ingres fails to grasp the fact that the very difficulties to which he refers constitute one of the chief elements in the disciplinary value of the study. He adds that the argument based upon the value of Latin as a means of drill may be stated thus: "Classical studies are *useful because they are useless.*" By what mental process M. Ingres was able to arrive at this summary is left for our readers to determine.

In his discussion under the second head we have some more pedagogical morsels of rare sweetness; e.g.: "There is no language which is not best studied by itself." This theme, however, M. Ingres feels to be too stirring for calm statement. We are treated to a series of rhetorical questions. "Did Homer know Aryan? Did Cicero know the origin of Latin? Did M^{me} de Sévigné know Greek?" The sentence, "The argument drawn from etymologies is a joke," only serves to give us some idea of the keenness of M. Ingres' sense of humor. Strong confirmatory evidence along the same lines is furnished by the following: "For a writer it is not more useful to know the etymology of the words he uses than it is for a painter to know when, where, and how the colors of his palette were made, and to what special breed belonged the pig which furnished the bristles of his brush."

But it is in his discussion of the moral effect of classical studies that M. Ingres is most instructive. His righteous indignation knows no bounds. He quotes Bastiat's statement that the Romans were a "nation of brigands and slaves," and he adds his own belief that "both their history and their literature are full of facts to justify such a judgment." But he puts the matter more concretely, and in the promiscuous image-smashing which follows not even the venerable Cato escapes. "Was Cato," M. Ingres asks, "a generous and manly man? Was Cicero a model of humility? Is Caesar trustworthy? Does he not boast of having made money by selling one million Gauls as slaves? Did not Virgil accept money, and can he serve as a model of a disinterested man or of a courtier?"

But let us not despair. In his conclusion M. Ingres says that he does not favor the total abolition of the classics. We are saved.

HERODOTUS AND THE ORACLE AT DELPHI

BY ARTHUR FAIRBANKS
University of Iowa

About the middle of the fifth century at Athens, Sophocles and Herodotus—the dramatist who best exemplified the spirit of the Athenian people and the *raconteur* who is said to have been honored by a gift of ten talents from these same Athenians—glorified in their writings the oracle at Delphi. The *Oedipus Tyrannus* might almost be termed a “miracle play” in honor of the Delphic Apollo. The stories of Croesus, of Cypselus, of Battus in Herodotus, his account of Sparta and Athens, his treatment of the Persian war, all are tinged more or less with a Delphic coloring. One is tempted to ask whether the oracle had fallen into disrepute through its temporizing policy toward Persia, whether the attitude of these the most popular writers of the age was the result of a conscious effort on the part of the Delphians to win fresh credence for the ancient seat of divination. It is possible, just possible, that here as at other points Sophocles was influenced by one with whom he must have been somewhat closely associated for a time in the group of artists and authors gathered about Pericles. For Herodotus, there is every reason to believe that he was selected by the Delphic priests as the special apologist of the oracle. To review some of the evidence for this position, and to determine on this basis just what the claims of Delphi were, is the subject of the present paper.

Herodotus either quotes or summarizes more than fifty utterances of the oracle. Of the one hundred and sixty additional oracles collected by Hendess, a few are from Diodorus, Plutarch, Athenaeus; a considerable number from Pausanias; most of the remainder are quoted by Christian writers or in scholia to ancient authors, ordinarily without indication of their source. Approximately a quarter of all the extant oracles are given by Herodotus; there is reason to think that nearly half of these were given him at Delphi, either genuine oracles or oracles forged by the Delphic source in the form of genuine

oracles; many of the remainder were known to his informers from the files of oracles which were kept in cities like Athens and Sparta.¹ The oracles in Herodotus that are contaminated by non-Delphic sources seem to be very few; on the other hand, most of the oracles in later writers show the influence either of local tradition or of the chresmologic poems—the collections of oracles under the name of Bacis, Glanis, or the Sibyl—or of other non-Delphic material. In considering the second question I have proposed, the question as to the claims of Delphi, genuine oracles and oracles forged at Delphi—two groups that include nearly all the oracles mentioned by Herodotus—are alike important; both groups represent the claims of the Delphic god. In a word, the importance of the writings of Herodotus for a knowledge of Delphic claims and Delphic influence rests (1) on the fact that he is far the earliest writer who gives much material; (2) on the number of oracles he quotes; and (3) on the Delphic origin of these oracles (whether forged or genuine).

I. HERODOTUS THE SPECIAL APOLOGIST FOR THE DELPHIC ORACLE

It has long been recognized that Herodotus secured much material for his work at the Delphic shrine. An examination of the parts of his history in question proves at once his desire to do honor to Apollo; nor is it difficult to read between the lines the narrative of some Delphic priest, answering the questions of an inquisitive traveler, now furnishing the oracle that was realized in an event familiar to the visitor, or again explaining and excusing some apparent error commonly attributed to the god. For the purposes of this paper, I shall ask some of the questions Herodotus must have asked at Delphi, and point out from his history the character of the answers he received.²

1. The detailed list of costly objects dedicated at Apollo's shrine by Gyges, Halyattes, and Croesus proves the interest of Herodotus in this friendship between the god and the great kings of Lydia. The fall of Croesus was the first tragic event in the war between Persia and Greece—a tragedy that had deeply impressed our author. The traveler could but ask his Delphic guide: "Did Apollo betray his friends? Croesus, who sent these splendid monuments? Or

¹ v. 90; vi. 57.

² The method of Oeri, *De Herodoti fonte Delphico* (Basel, 1899), I believe to be correct, though I differ from some of his results in detail.

again a tyrant like Cypselus, who is said to have built the treasure house of the Corinthians? Or Battus, who was bidden to found Cyrene? Or Arcesilaus III, whom Apollo sent back to Cyrene with promises of success?" The proof that these kings were friends of Apollo lay before his eyes. How did the Delphic priesthood explain the facts?

Herodotus gives us their answer. As for Croesus, he had been distinctly warned against a battle on the Halys against a leader who was of double origin, like a mule.¹ Moreover, when he asked about his dumb son,² the Pythia had foretold disaster. When Croesus himself claimed that he had been betrayed, the priests said that Apollo had done his best for him—he had delayed, but could not altogether prevent, the fulfilment of an oracle to Gyges that in the fourth generation the race tainted by crime should meet its doom.³ As for Battus, Apollo had certainly bidden him to found Cyrene. At Delphi, however, the oracle was quoted to Herodotus in an abbreviated form without the large promises which Pindar and others had found connected with it.⁴ The god had foretold ultimate disaster to the race of Arcesilaus,⁵ and had bidden him exercise clemency. To Cypselus, and to Cleisthenes also, according to the Delphic informer of Herodotus, the god had foretold future disaster.

2. But what about the *character* of these friends of Apollo? Did the god of light favor with his friendship Gyges who secured the kingdom by crime? the enemies of Greek liberty, the tyrants Cypselus and Cleisthenes? To the traveler who asked such questions—and Herodotus would not have been the first to ask them—an answer was ready. Gyges⁶ had been confirmed in the kingdom; it had been necessary to end dissension among the Lydians; yet the god had foretold disaster to his race in the end. Over against the claim of Cypselus⁷ to Apollo's favor was set an oracle warning the Corinthians of their danger; to the oracle⁸ promising him prosperity, the Delphians added a third verse proclaiming disaster to his race. Cleisthenes⁹ had been called *λευστήρα* ("a cruel oppressor who stoned the citizens"?) when he consulted the oracle about the hero Adrastus.

¹ i. 55.³ i. 91; i. 13.⁵ iv. 163.⁷ v. 92β.⁹ v. 67.² i. 85.⁴ iv. 155.⁶ i. 13.⁸ v. 92ε.

These two questions were answered to the satisfaction of Herodotus. In his history he defended Apollo against the charge that he betrayed his friends, and against the charge that the god had befriended the enemies of Greece. Although he freely incorporated material from other sources, it is comparatively easy for the student to detect just what story was told at Delphi to him and to any traveler who asked questions that might have proved embarrassing.

3. It seems that when Herodotus went to Delphi he was already familiar with the history of Athens and Sparta. With reference to several points he presents a double tradition, the local account which charged the Delphic oracle with failure to predict the truth, and an account, apparently of Delphic origin, which explained, refuted, or denied these charges. Either Herodotus brought these questions to Delphi, we may fairly assume, and furnishes us the answers he received, or possibly the priests recognized in him a valuable apologist, and gave him both the criticism and the answer to it with the intention that he defend the god on charges they knew were being brought against him.

For example: Sparta, having conquered Messene, desired to press northward into Arcadia. An oracle promised them Tegea¹ "to dance in, and measure off with a rope." In the period of Athenian supremacy, about the middle of the fifth century, such an oracle might well have roused the anger of the Athenians, who were interested in holding the Spartans in check. Possibly² the first verses were forged at Delphi to prove that Apollo had not incited the war, but had modified a demand of Sparta for all Arcadia. The lines about Tegea, as the priests would point out to Herodotus, had a double meaning; they were fulfilled when Spartan captives in chain gangs were forced to cultivate the fields of Tegea. The second oracle,³ about the bones of Orestes, bears no mark of Delphic modification; it may well have been genuine whether Herodotus got it at Delphi or at Sparta.

Herodotus mentions two cases in which the oracle at Delphi was reputed to have been bribed by money. According to a story⁴ he heard at Athens (from the opponents of Pericles), the Alcmaeonidae

¹ i. 66.

² Cp. Oeri, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

³ i. 67.

⁴ v. 63.

bribed the Pythia to send Spartans against the Pisistratidae in Athens. The Spartans, contrary to their own interest, did drive out the Pisistratidae, and the Alcmaeonidae again became the controlling factor in a democratic state. The cautious way in which Herodotus tells the story, and the doubt he expressed later,¹ "If they really did persuade the Pythia, etc.," suggest that Herodotus discussed the tale with his Delphic guides, who denied its truth.

On another occasion the oracle was bribed by Cleomenes to answer that Demaratus was not the son of Ariston.² Herodotus adds that, when it was discovered, Cobon, the tool of Cleomenes, was banished, and Perialle, the priestess, deposed from her office. At the same time Herodotus indicates his belief that the Pythia told the truth. We may assume that in this instance the Delphic attendants admitted the bribery of the oracle, furnished Herodotus with the names of the officials who had been punished for it, and yet claimed that the response of the Pythia had been a true one.

4. The most important question that could be raised with reference to the honor of the Delphic god has to do with his attitude in the Persian wars. It is perfectly clear that in this part of his work Herodotus is *not* the apologist for the Delphic oracle. His account³ of the god's command to invoke the winds, and of the Persian attack on Delphi is clearly of Delphic origin; but when he comes to the oracle to which Mardonius pinned his faith, the oracle that the Persian army would be destroyed if they attacked Delphi, he is forced to turn to the collection of Bacis and to insert an oracle which, he says, did not really apply to the Persians. In the first six books he appears as the apologist of the oracle on the basis of material furnished him by the priests—material much of which seems to have been forged at Delphi with the express purpose of defending the oracle from criticism. In the last three books he mentions without comment oracles which clearly show the "Medism" of Delphi; only twice does he give material gained at Delphi, and this is not at all controversial in character; in one definite instance he is driven to seek in the compilation of Bacis an oracle favorable to the claims of the shrine. Did Herodotus feel that the Delphic oracle was discredited

¹ vi. 123.² vi. 66.³ vii. 178; viii. 35-39.

by its attitude toward Persia? Or were these books written after he had gone from Athens to Thurii?

That the Delphic shrine looked forward to the success of Xerxes, and gave oracles on this basis, seems clear. The Cretans¹ were bidden to refrain from the war; the Argives²—if this oracle belongs where it is placed by the historian—received advice of similar import; the Athenians³ were told that Athens would be destroyed; the Spartans⁴, somewhat later, were bidden to demand reparation for the death of Leonidas and to *accept whatever Xerxes offered*. The statement⁵ that either Sparta or a Spartan king must perish was shrewd enough; it was not encouraging. That Gelon⁶ should select Delphi as a place for deposit of moneys to be given to Xerxes in case of his success, casts a shade of doubt on the oracle. That Apollo must demand from Aegina⁷ the prize for bravery at Salamis looks as if the Aeginetans did not feel deeply indebted to him for his aid. On the other hand, the allies⁸ did dedicate offerings at Delphi as well as at Olympia; at Delphi and at Athens⁹ there were monuments to the winds, whose aid Apollo had bidden the Greeks invoke.

The account of the Persian attack on Delphi¹⁰ is just what one would expect in case the Delphic shrine wished to prove that it had not favored the Persians. Today, as in the days of Herodotus, one may see the rocks that fell and crushed the Persians; the evidence is worth as much today as it was when the Delphic priests told Herodotus their tale. It is true that the attitude of the shrine had been so guarded that Xerxes may not have fully understood it; it is true that he knew of the riches gathered there, nor was he overcareful not to commit sacrilege; it is possible that the oracle trusted by Mardonius, "Pillage Delphi and be destroyed," may have been given after the retreat of Xerxes, as Busolt suggests.¹¹ On the whole, modern writers are inclined to adopt the principle of Ephorus, though they use it somewhat differently, and rationalize the tale. In any case, it is clear that Herodotus got his story at Delphi. According to the version of the priests, Apollo defended his shrine by supernatural means when the Persians attacked it, thereby proving that he was

¹ vii. 169.

³ vii. 140.

⁵ vii. 220.

⁷ viii. 122.

⁹ vii. 178, 189.

² vii. 148.

⁴ viii. 114.

⁶ vii. 163.

⁸ ix. 81.

¹⁰ viii. 35-39.

¹¹ Busolt *Griechische Geschichte* II². 689, A. 3, quoted with approval by Hauvette.

the all-powerful friend of Greece. The usefulness of this proof (which was certainly necessary) and the appeal to the fallen rocks arouse suspicion.

The fact remains that, but for this story of the rocks and the reference to a Delphic altar to the winds, the Delphic source does not appear in the last three books of the history. There are no cases of the revision of tales from local sources in the light of material found at Delphi.

It has often been pointed out that almost all the oracles which Herodotus got at Delphi are quoted in their metrical form, while oracles from other sources are frequently given only in substance. That the Delphic "Commentaries" were in written form, a book of oracles (forged and genuine) together with notes and explanations to prove the power of the Delphic Apollo, is a just inference.

It remains to be proven that anyone besides Herodotus has drawn largely from this source. I am inclined to agree with Oeri¹ that Herodotus was selected by the Delphic priests as their special apologist, and that special pains were taken to furnish him with the Delphic version of Greek history. I should go farther than Oeri in saying that Herodotus had too much historical sense to fulfil the task laid upon him. In his earlier books the non-Delphic version of Delphic tales can often be made out clearly. Where the Delphic shrine most needed defense, in explaining its attitude during the Persian wars, Herodotus failed the priests entirely. The reason for this is most easily found in the assumption that when he wrote these books he had already left Greece and was no longer under the influence of the Delphic priesthood.

II. THE CLAIMS OF THE DELPHIC ORACLE

The second question I have proposed has to do with the claims of the Delphic oracle. Granted that Herodotus is the one special apologist of this shrine, so far as Greek literature is preserved to us, and that he has been instructed by the priests in their doctrine of Apollo as an infallible prophet, inspired guide in politics, morals, and religion, we could find no better means for determining the claims of Delphi than by the study of this history. Nor is it necessary for such a study

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 67 f.

to distinguish forged deliverances of the god from those that are genuine. In many instances the forgeries can be detected, but both classes alike illustrate the *claims* of the shrine; only when we wish to weigh these claims is it necessary to throw out forgeries and forged emendations.

In general, the Delphic shrine claimed that the priestess gave inspired responses to questions about what was beyond the range of human knowledge. These responses, to judge from the samples preserved by Herodotus, did not always answer the questions that were asked, for sometimes the god furnished information more important than that which the questioner asked; they were often in the form of riddles, though the priests claimed that these riddles should be clear enough to intelligent men; many of them were perfectly definite, enforcing a few principles, which will presently be stated. From other sources one learns something of the method by which the oracle was consulted, the character of the priestess, the way the question was put, the part of the priests in giving the answer metrical form, etc. That all such things are omitted without comment by Herodotus, that he uses the simple formula, "The Pythia answered," might lead to the inference that he knew little or nothing of the paraphernalia of the shrine. I believe this inference to be substantially true, not because he was not interested to investigate the matter, but rather because the priests sought to conceal it. Whatever the explanation, he invariably gives the claim of the shrine in its simplest form. The god knows what man does not know; he answers directly through the priestess questions about this unknown; on this imposing claim rested the dignity and influence of the shrine.

If, now, we go further, and ask just what sort of answers about the future were given, and what general principles guided these answers, the oracles quoted to Herodotus give much information.

1. The Delphic oracle claimed to guide *individuals* who sought its aid. That the oracles of Herodotus were given to public men, prophets and kings, is to be explained by the nature of his work. Halyattes sent to Delphi about his illness; Croesus, about his son's deafness; Tisamenes came to inquire about offspring. The last receives a promise of glory in great contests; Croesus is warned of evil; Halyattes alone gets what he came for—the knowledge that by

rebuilding a temple of Athena the divine cause of his illness would be removed.

2. The Delphic oracle claimed to meet difficulties in the internal administration of Greek states. It confirmed and overthrew dynasties, as in Lydia and Cyrene. In general, the deliverances of the oracle confirmed the party in power, while it foretold the final overthrow of dynasties which gained the power by unjust means. In Lydia the Heracleidae, then the overthrower of the Heracleidae, were confirmed in their power, while to the race of Gyges the limit was set at four generations. So at Cyrene there were to be four kings of the name of Battus, four of the name of Arcesilaus.

Further, the Delphic oracle claimed the power to put an end to political confusion. It claimed to have given the constitution of Sparta to Lycurgus, to decide on the legitimacy of Spartan kings; it sent an arbitrator from Mantinea to Cyrene; it promised the Dolonci a deliverer, who turned out to be Miltiades.

In particular, states turned to Delphi for aid in the time of a plague. In such instances the oracle first stated the cause of the plague, then the remedy. Trees died of drought at Thera¹ because no colony in Libya had been founded, as Apollo had bidden; when Battus set out for Libya, the plague ceased. At Epidaurus² the unfruitfulness of plants and animals was due to failure to worship the divinities of growth; the people were bidden to worship Damia and Auxesia.³ At Lemnos⁴ a similar plague was due to the cruelty of the people toward their Athenian wives; recompense must be made to the Athenians. Delphi⁵ itself suffered from a plague as a result of the cruel murder of Aesop; the plague ceased when it paid a sum of money to the injured family. The blindness of the Cnidians,⁶ who attempted to make their peninsula an island, was explained as due to this interference with the laws of nature. These plagues were explained as caused by transgression of moral law, or by neglect of some divinity; in almost every instance the appeal to the oracle was used to confirm Delphi in its claim to be the moral and religious guide of Greece.

3. The Delphic god guides the colonies founded by Greek states. Herodotus mentions the oracles in regard to only three attempts at

¹ iv. 150 f. ² v. 82. ³ 1 Cf. i. 167. ⁴ vi. 139. ⁵ ii. 134. ⁶ i. 174.

colonization; these, however, illustrate the claims of the god. The Spartans¹ under Dorieus founded a colony, we are told, "without consulting Delphi as to the place, or performing any of the customary rites." Driven out from Libya, and returning unsuccessful, they did consult the Delphic god, whereupon their venture in Sybaris was crowned with his blessing. It appeared that Delphi had gained the *right* to be consulted about colonies. Herodotus quotes several oracles, and mentions several more, in his account of Cyrene. In this instance it appears that the original idea that the Theraeans found a colony in Libya² was suggested to their king when he consulted the oracle about other matters. When a plague had warned them of the displeasure of Apollo, if we may accept the Delphic interpretation, and when yet other evils drove them to consult the god, the answer³ was still: "Found a colony in Libya." Twice the colonists who had obeyed the god sought to return; Apollo did not permit them, but instead urged all the Greeks who came to Delphi to join the colony at Cyrene. Apollo, we may infer, claimed the right to dictate to a state that it send out a colony, the right to say where the colony should be founded, and the right to supervise the affairs of the nascent state. In no other sphere of its activity does the political shrewdness of the priests appear to better advantage.

4. The Delphic oracle claimed to guide the Greek states in war. Inasmuch as both parties were likely to consult the oracle, and the issue of the war was often uncertain, the task of answering the questions put to the oracle in such wise as to maintain the influence of the shrine as arbiter of Greece, must have been an extremely delicate one. The priests of the Delphic god seem to have made three claims to Herodotus: (1) the god warns those who seek his advice of impending calamity; (2) the god checks arrogant plans by advising moderation and delay; (3) the god sometimes suggests a divinity or hero by whose worship victory may be obtained. The Athenians were bidden, said the priests, to wait thirty years before attacking Aegina, and meanwhile to establish the worship of Aeacus; after both conditions were fulfilled, the victory of Athens was complete. The victory of the Greeks at Artemisium was claimed by the oracle to be the result of its advice to worship the winds. Naturally the

¹ v. 42.² iv. 150.³ iv. 156.

priests laid even more stress on the first point, the warning of impending calamity. Croesus, they said, had been warned to flee when a mule became king of the Persians; Siphnus had not heeded the warning against the red herald; the fall of Miletus was foreseen and foretold by the god. With reference to the expedition of Xerxes I have tried to show that Herodotus does not give us the standpoint of Delphi with the same definiteness as elsewhere. No doubt it was politic for the oracle to advise Argos and Crete not to join the war, to predict the fall of Athens, to answer the Spartans that their city or one of its kings should fall. How the priests would have explained the so-called "Medism" of the oracle we do not know.

5. It has already appeared that the oracle claimed to be a guide in Greek worship, especially the worship of heroes. In general, its influence was exerted to establish or to resuscitate the worship of purely local divinities. The worship of the winds at Delphi and of Boreas at Athens might be classed as local. Orestes' bones were brought to Sparta, Cyrenus was worshiped at Velia, rites to heroes were established at Agylla, Aeacus obtained a shrine at Athens—all as the result of oracles delivered by the Delphic Apollo. In general, these local worships meant more for popular religion than the more imposing state worship; it is not so much that Apollo turned against the worship of the greater gods, as that he sought to develop a more vital religion among the people.

In two instances the Delphic god speaks in favor of the servants of local religion. A priestess at Paros,¹ Timo by name, was charged with complicity in the attack of Miltiades; when the matter was referred to Delphi, the god bade the Parians to release her, asserting that Miltiades, the real offender, would be punished. Again the god commanded reparation to one Euenius² who had been punished too severely for alleged neglect of duty in his sacred office.

6. Finally, to judge from the oracles quoted by Herodotus, the Delphic shrine claimed to be a moral guide to the Greeks. The punishment of sin is a favorite theme in Herodotus; in the oracles themselves, moreover, not simply in his comments, the principle is frequently enunciated that sin is punished in the end. To Cypselus,

¹ vi. 135.

² ix. 93.

to Gyges, to the Battiadae, are given assurances of temporary prosperity and final overthrow. One of the most interesting cases is that of Glaucus,¹ the Spartan who dared ask the oracle whether he might keep money which he had sworn to pay. No doubt the oracle was forged after the extermination of his family, but—probably under Delphic influence—the fact was made the text for an oracle in which this dire punishment was predicted. The man who *purposed* to break his oath—such was the sentiment attributed to the Pythia—was to be punished as severely as though he had carried out his purpose; though the punishment was delayed, it was none the less sure.

In one other point the oracles cited by Herodotus bear testimony to this ethical influence. Again and again these deliverances demand a recompense for cruelty and murder; not the recompense in kind which led to blood-feuds among primitive peoples, but rather a fine in money. Ordinarily some plague sends the offending party to Delphi for aid. The Lemnians who slew their conspiring wives are bidden to pay what recompense their Athenian kindred demand; the Delphians themselves are to make money recompense to the relatives of Aesop for his cruel death; apparently it is a money recompense which the Spartans were to demand for the death of Leonidas. Only in the case of the Agyllaeans did religious rites atone for cruel deeds. That cruelty and murder were to be punished even when they were the acts of the state; that this punishment was to be of such a character as not to provoke further deeds of violence—such was the principle inculcated by the answers of the oracle.

The lesson of Herodotus consists in these imposing claims of the oracle. To estimate the importance of these claims, to offer any explanation for the truth that lies behind them, to investigate the ritual by which oracles were given, are tasks which I have intentionally set aside in order to study Herodotus' testimony in itself.

¹ vi. 86.

A NOTE¹ ON *RAPUIT* IN VIRGIL *AENEID* I. 176

Ac primum silici scintillam excudit Achates
suscepitque ignem foliis, atque arida circum
nutrimenta dedit, rapuitque in fomite flammam.

The ordinary school editions of the *Aeneid* either fail entirely to explain the meaning of *rapuitque in fomite flammam* or do so in a very unsatisfactory manner. The earliest explanation was given by Servius in his commentary on this passage. He defines *rapuit* as *raptim* (i. e., *celeriter*) *jecit flammam in fomite*. Heyne substantially reiterates this explanation in his brief note, and is followed by a large number of modern editors. Wagner departs entirely from the traditional rendering, and suggests that *rapuit* refers to the waving to and fro by Achates of the mass of fuel enveloping the smoldering leaves to produce a flame. He adds that the shepherds of his own day produced a blaze by putting a bit of smoldering punk in a bundle of straw, and when this was waved in the air it burst into flame. This explanation has been characterized by Henry, Forbiger, and Benoist as "gratuitous," "paullo subtilior," and "bien subtile." Others, including Ladewig, Duvaux, Anthon, and apparently Frieze (in his vocabulary), agree with Wagner without strengthening his position in any way. So far as the Latinity of the passage is concerned, there is little to choose between the two interpretations, as no parallels are produced in either case. Henry maintains that there is no indication of how the flame was produced. But is it likely that Virgil would be guilty of such an important omission in a description so carefully elaborated?

Fire-making by the method in vogue before the introduction of matches falls into three divisions: (1) the obtaining of the spark; (2) the igniting of the tinder; (3) the production of the flame. The third is by far the most difficult operation. We have abundant proof that Virgil was well acquainted with woodcraft and all the details of Italian country life. He is fond of displaying very detailed knowledge of a subject in a highly expressive word or phrase. In the present instance he devotes three lines to *describe* what he might very well have *indicated* in three words. It is scarcely conceivable that he omitted, as Henry holds, the most important part of the process. Some confirmation of this view is afforded by the

¹ Contributions in the form of Notes or Discussions should be sent to Henry A. Sanders, 1227 Washtenaw Avenue, Ann Arbor, Mich.

fact that both Valerius Flaccus (ii. 448) and Boileau (cited by de Lille, in the introduction to his translation of the *Georgics*, p. 33), in passages apparently based on this, include this part of the incident, but explain that the blaze was produced by the use of sulphur. Now we know that smoldering leaves or punk will not blaze except by the use of sulphur or the application of a draft by fanning, blowing, or waving. Anyone familiar with the practice of the North American Indian a generation ago in the northern woods is aware that he did precisely as Wagner says the shepherd of his day did. The smoldering punk was inclosed in a bundle of frayed cedar bark, if possible, and waved rapidly to and fro until it burst into flame. And it seems that in no other way, under the circumstances, could a flame be produced. This meets the objection of Henry that it is as reasonable to suppose that Achates blew the ignited leaves into a blaze. His reference to Ovid (*Met.* viii. 641) is not in point, for there the basis of the fire was a bed of coals under the ashes of an old fire, which would alter the situation completely. It is reasonable to suppose the Italian peasant of Virgil's day did exactly as the German peasant and the North American Indian did under similar circumstances, and that Virgil was familiar with this custom. Shipwrecked Trojans were in all likelihood without such appliances as sulphur, which was doubtless used in Rome in Virgil's day. Moreover, if Virgil had intended, as Heyne would have us believe, to end his description in such a trivial manner he could have easily found a less vague way of expressing quickness. The word *rapuit*, however, suggests very vividly the rapid motion of Achates' arm as he waved the mass of fuel back and forth. The figurative use of the same verb in *Aen.* iv. 286 is based upon this idea of rapid motion to and fro. Achates seems in reality to snatch the flame that burst out in the bundle of kindling matter (*fomite*). The sense of the passage is then: "he fanned the touchwood into flame by waving it in the air."

ROBERT J. BONNER.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Reports from the Classical Field

It is the purpose of this department to keep the readers of the *Journal* informed of events and undertakings in the classical field, and to make them familiar with the varying conditions under which classical work is being done, and with the aims and experiences of those who are in one way or another endeavoring to increase its effectiveness.

The success of the department will naturally depend to a great extent on the co-operation of the individual readers themselves. Everyone interested in the *Journal* and in what it is trying to do is therefore cordially invited to report anything of interest that may come to his notice. Inquiries and suggestions will also be useful in directing the attention of the editors to things which may otherwise escape their notice. Communications should be addressed to J. J. Schlicher, 1811 N. Eighth Street, Terre Haute, Ind.

Presentation of the "Captivi" at Earlham College.—The great handicap of a small college in the production of a Latin play is the limited number of students from whom competent actors can be selected. The Earlham performance, however, was unusually fortunate in this respect, even though it was necessary to choose several students who had not specialized in Latin. The part of Ergasilus, particularly, was acted with life and spirit.

The performance was given in College Hall at Richmond, Ind., under the auspices of the Latin Club. The programme of the club during the year had been a study of the classical drama, and the original intention was to present only one or two acts of a play of Plautus. The growth of interest in the ideal however, and a clearer conception of its feasibility, resulted in the development of the larger plan.

Such an ideal performance as the one at Harvard was of course impossible. An accurate quantitative rendering of the lines was given up early in the course of the rehearsals, as it became evident that with the time at their disposal—the performers had to carry all their regular work in addition to this—several of them would sacrifice therefor the really intelligent and spirited interpretation of the parts, and this latter aim was constantly held up as the *sine qua non*. In the face of much friendly warning, to the effect that there should be no music without accurate scansion, it was decided to introduce the Frederic DeForest Allen *Phormio* music during all the *cantica*. While this was undertaken with some misgivings, the result was entirely satisfactory. The effect of this characteristic musical "background" was good, and it was distinctly appreciated by the audience. There was no difficulty in so directing the instruments as to secure loud and soft, spirited and quiet effects, in harmony with the spirit of the lines. The *tibicen scaenicus* played his part with the double flute so perfectly as to

deceive many in the audience. The score of Professor Allen's music was changed so as to drop out the bassoon (no competent player being available) and substitute the flute for the oboe, the latter proving too shrill and strong for a small auditorium; this left the flute and two clarinets.

The costumes, with the exception of two, and the wigs, beards, and shoes were made on the campus. It was a pleasant task to follow the Harvard models, although Indiana seemed sufficiently remote from Boston to make the use of undervests and "tights"—the costume of the *puer* alone excepted—unnecessary. The scenery required for the *Captives* is very simple, and it was not difficult to arrange an entirely adequate stage-setting—the house, filling the entire background, the streets, and the altars.

The introductory and explanatory address by the Hon. W. D. Foulke, and a libretto containing a metrical translation of all the longer speeches and full synopses of the rest, served to orient the audience, which was for the most part a popular one.

It may be of interest to some to know that the total expenses of the performance were little over a hundred dollars. C. K. C.

A "Latin Commencement" at the South Omaha High School.—This entertainment, conceived of as a means of bringing Latin within the interests of pupils and parents in a packing-house town, was naturally undertaken by the Latin teachers of the high school with not a little fear. For all its novelty, however, or perhaps partly because of it, the event created widespread interest, drew a crowded house, and left \$125 as net proceeds. The entertainment, for the success of which every pupil in the department worked most willingly, consisted of Latin songs and declamations, a mock trial, a Roman school, and a short farce, *The Court of Juno*.

The Court of Juno, a lyrical drama in two acts, contrasted the present with the mythological ages, and portrayed the changes wrought by religious and scientific thought in moral and physical life.

The mock trial had a complete modern equipment of judge, jury, court reporter, bailiff, etc. In it the three upper classes, through their counsel, preferred charges against Virgil, Cicero, and Caesar. By means of the latest invention—connection by telephone with King Pluto—Mercury was instructed to conduct the accused before the "Classical Court." As each indictment came up, the attorneys for the prosecution argued the case admirably, and just as eloquently the Romans defended themselves. Virgil and Cicero were acquitted by the jury and sent back to Hades. In the case of Caesar, however, witnesses were introduced, one of whom was Ariovistus, subpoenaed from the lower world. Though the accused defended himself ably, he was found guilty and sentenced to "build a bridge across the Missouri exactly like the one he built across the Rhine, and to stand ready to explain the building of it to any Latin student who came to him." The prisoners, as well as the witness, wore the dress of their times.

The little boys who belonged to the Roman school were freshmen. They entered the schoolroom playing *pila*, and when called to order, recited their

multiplication tables, language and geography lessons, spoke pieces and sang, all in Latin, quite readily. One little fellow who was late and received a flogging, shouted, "Bonus ero, magister; bonus ero, magister," quite as if he meant it. Later on he redeemed himself by reciting

Mica, mica, parva stella,
Miror quatenam sis, tam bella.

A song to Aurora at the beginning of the entertainment, and *Gaudeamus igitur* during one of the intervals, were sung by a chorus of seventy-five voices.

A. M. F.

Hermann Usener, 1834-1905.—On October 21 Hermann Usener died in Bonn, where for nearly forty years he had lived and taught, at the age of seventy-one. His name is perhaps less well known than that of many others, who by works of a more general or summarizing nature are constantly brought to the attention of fellow-workers, but few greater classical scholars have lived in our time. It reveals a characteristic trait of his restless, penetrating mind that practically all of his publications, whether put forth as books or as shorter monographs, were in the strictest sense works of investigation. To him more than to any other one man we owe the great, though gradual, transformation in classical studies which the last three decades have witnessed—the collapse of the stately structure of *Allertums-wissenschaft*, which Wolf and Boeckh had elaborated, and the replacing of its parts in their proper relationship to the framework of history as a whole. He was impatient of conventional boundary lines in the territory of scholarship, and in nearly every subject which he studied he transcended in all directions the usual barriers which confine the vision of the classical student. He loved wide horizons and deep perspectives, and all of his published work bears evidence of this craving for a complete historical understanding.

But, in spite of his great attainments and the number and importance of his published works, he looked upon himself primarily as a teacher. What he was in this capacity only those can know who were privileged to enjoy his instruction; but for the world at large it could be demonstrated impressively by a mere list of his pupils, or by an enumeration of the works of others which profess their debt of obligation to his suggestion and guidance. After the withdrawal of Ritschl in 1865, and the untimely death of Jahn in 1868, it seemed as if the famous school of classical philology in Bonn was destined soon to be no more than a memory of past greatness. That it maintained its leadership for another generation was due in largest measure to the genius and devotion of two men, Usener and his brilliant colleague Buecheler, whose name cannot be repressed here, after so many years of almost inseparable association with the name of him who has now gone before.

G. L. H.

St. Louis High Schools.—A recent change leaves Latin as the only language for the four years of the high-school course known as the "Teachers' Preparatory." Latin is required throughout the course.

Greek is now given at the Central and the McKinley High Schools, and will be offered at the Yeatman at the beginning of the February term. It is said that there are more Greek pupils at the Central High School than in all the high schools of Chicago.

Lawrence University, Appleton, Wis.—The institution has been provided with increased library facilities for classical work, and five graduates (four in Latin and one in Greek) are working for their master's degree. Additional courses in Greek have been introduced by Professor Albert A. Trever, who has recently been appointed to the chair of Greek.

Mr. Athol Robbins, the Rhodes scholar from Wisconsin this year and a Lawrence man, intends to devote his three years at Oxford to Greek and Latin.

University of Mississippi.—Classical education in the South has suffered a serious loss in the resignation of Dr. P. H. Saunders, professor of Greek at this university. By his enthusiasm and magnetism he had greatly increased the number of classical students in the schools of the state, and had raised the standard of scholarship. He is now president of a bank at Laurel, Miss.

Roxbury Latin School.—Headmaster William C. Collar is beginning his fiftieth year of service at the school.

Clarence W. Gleason, for sixteen years an instructor, has resigned to go to the Volkmann School, a boy's preparatory school in Boston. His successor is Reginald Foster, Harvard, 1903, who comes from the St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.

University of Missouri.—Several changes have occurred in the department of Latin. Professor Jones is obliged by an increased enrolment to give more of his time to his duties as dean. Miss Eva Johnston has returned from a year's leave of absence spent in Königsberg, where she took her doctor's degree. Dr. E. H. Sturtevant, who occupied her place in her absence, has gone to Indiana University. Additions to the instructional force are Howard V. Canter, Ph.D. (Washington and Lee), instructor in Latin, and Truman Michelson, Ph.D. (Harvard), who has the work in Sanskrit and comparative philology. The latter is busied with a study of the root *khyā* in Pāli and Prākṛit, while the former is continuing his work along the lines of his doctor's dissertation, which dealt with infinitive constructions in Livy.

The Harvard and Yale Examinations.—A great deal of complaint is being made by preparatory schools over the failure of Harvard and Yale to make the same division of the entrance Latin requirements between the preliminary and the final examinations. In schools which prepare for both, a wasteful extra provision is regularly necessary in order to accommodate a few students. It appears, however, from an article in a recent number of the *Educational Review*, that Harvard is showing some willingness to accept the requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board of the Middle States and Maryland.

Book Reviews

The Life of the Ancient Greeks. By CHARLES BURTON GULICK.
New York: D. Appleton & Co. Pp. xii + 373. \$1.40 net.

The publication of this book belongs to a movement in the teaching and the study of Greek which deserves the greatest encouragement. The elective system is now thoroughly established as a policy, not only in universities and colleges, but in high schools as well. It is evident, then, that Greek must stand or fall on its merits. It will not continue to be studied merely because it has been included in the fixed curricula of past years. Nor will Greek studies long maintain their place among the subjects elected by students of the present day, if Greek literature continues to be made the mere vehicle for conveying a knowledge of Greek forms and syntax. Other phases of Greek studies must be given more emphasis in the future than they have received in the past. Greek literature must be made the basis for a wider study of the history, art, social life, and mythology of the Greek people. These features of Greek studies are both interesting and valuable to students of the present day, and it is quite possible for teachers to treat them in connection with the reading of Greek authors, to say nothing of presenting them independently. In fact, a lively interest is thereby added to the reading of the literature. Not only is this true, but actual experience has shown that students who have, without any knowledge of the Greek language, undertaken the study of Greek history, art, mythology, or manners and customs, have been inspired with a desire to know the literature of the Greeks at first hand.

The author of *The Life of the Ancient Greeks* has planned his book admirably to accomplish these good results. He has treated the subjects briefly but clearly. He has confined himself to a definite field, and has presented the well-established facts in that field, and he has avoided the mistake which many writers on similar subjects have made, of presenting his own conjectures as demonstrated truth.

After giving a brief description of Greece, Attica, and Athens, the author treats of the dwellings of the Greeks; their childhood, school training, and marriage; their food, clothing, social entertainments, and various callings; their hospitality, religion, death and burial, etc. Each subject is fully illustrated by excellent cuts, and the value of the book is still further enhanced by a bibliography of the themes of each chapter added as a supplement. It is an excellent book both for reference and as a textbook for the study of the manners and customs of the ancient Greeks, and will be of great value to all teachers of Greek.

W. G. MANLY.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.

Titi Livi ab Urbe Condita Libri. I, XXI, XXII. With Introduction and Commentary. By EMORY B. LEASE. New York: University Publishing Co., 1905. Pp. lxvii + 438. \$1.25.

This book makes a good impression at first sight. The introduction is elaborate, the notes extensive. The binding, paper, and printing do credit to the publishers, if we except a brief passage on p. 217, where the type was in some way injured. Especially the dedication to Professor Minton Warren, and the thanks given in the preface to Professors Lodge, Pais, and Knapp, give at least a hint that accuracy and learning are to be expected.

The text of Books I and XXII is from the last edition by M. Mueller; of Book XXI, from the last edition by Woelflin. The accuracy of the copy I can not fully determine, as my editions of these books are older, but changes involving errors of judgment or misprints are numerous: p. 3, l. 6, comma omitted after *Aeneam*; p. 4, l. 34, *factum* for *factam*; l. 59, comma inserted after *terras*; etc. But this is mild compared with the later portions. On p. 64 commas are omitted as follows: l. 1, after *praeferari*; l. 3, after *memorable*; l. 6, after *arma*; l. 10, after *fuertint*; l. 15, after *Hamilcari*; l. 18, after *se*, and after *posset*; l. 20, after *concessam*; and l. 21, after *Romanorum*. Five of these are certainly misprints; they make the text unintelligible to the young student.

If we turn to the introduction, the case is even worse. We find errors, careless statements, or needless repetitions on almost every page: p. x, Livy was on *familiar terms* with Claudius, afterward emperor; p. xi, his history is a *monument of eulogy* to the Roman people; it covered a period of over 750 years, from the landing of Aeneas to his own time (no, it was nearly 1,070 years, or, if he reckoned only from the founding of Rome, 745 years); p. xii, it was *published in decades* (a view long since abandoned); p. xiv, Livy's patriotic feelings often lead him to *color the narrative in favor of the Romans*; p. xvii, Florus in his *panegyric* (!) of the Roman people; . . . Valerius Maximus in his *History*; p. xviii, L. Calpurnius Piso *revised the Annales Maximi* and *began the Chronicle of the Pontifices*; . . . Livy makes extensive use of Claudius from Book III on (Read VI). But enumeration of these errors is both tiresome and fruitless.

The chief weight of the edition seems to lie in the study of Livy's language and style. This is the editor's special field, so we may expect accuracy here, if anywhere; but compare the following: p. xxxix, the partitive genitive depending on the neuter of an adjective is common in poetry and is first freely used in prose by Livy (cf. the statement in Allen and Grenough's *New Grammar*, § 346, 3, n. 1); p. xli, *haud* is the *favorite* negative with Livy; p. xliii, *ab Sicilia*, cited as a name of *town* with preposition; but I will not continue the enumeration. Not even the citations are accurate. On one page (xlvi), which I compared, I found the following mistakes: l. 7, for xxi. 14. 8, read xxi. 4. 8; l. 13, for xxi. 10. 5, read xxi. 10. 4; and for xxii. 18. 7, read xxi. 18. 7; l. 14, for xxii. 1. 8, read xxii. 18. 8.

If we turn now to the commentary, we find that enumerations and cross-

references are the rule. On p. 180 are tables giving number of instances of *quippe qui* and *ut qui* by decades, also of the omissions of *esse* or of the subject with the future infinitive; p. 183, n. 1, we learn that Livy uses the contracted forms of the perfect subjunctive rarely (12 times), greatly preferring the uncontracted (85 times); n. 2, before *l* Livy used *ac* 84 times, but *atque* only 4. I fail to see what interest such enumerations have for the college freshman. Yet he can skip them if not interested, and the teacher may perhaps get a little use out of them for the Latin writing work, assuming of course that the count is fairly accurate.

Much worse for the pupil is the system of cross-reference. Compare the following from p. 183: 51. *pereundi perdendique*: see §§ 59 and 63, a; *invexere*: see § 19, a; 52. *futurae*: "which will be:" see § 37, n.; *jorsitan* . . . : see § 49. E.; *initio* *ordiendae*: see § 62.

This is enough to exhaust the patience of even the most earnest pupil. There are over two thousand such cross-references in the notes alone. Very often, when you look up the reference, you find either a similar statement, or nothing in point, or a reference to still another passage.

The edition, in its present form, can not be recommended to the student beginning the study of Livy; yet there is a great deal of valuable information scattered through the book, which, if sifted and properly edited, would be valuable both for teacher and pupil.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

ANN ARBOR.

The Tragedies of Seneca. Rendered into English verse. By ELLA ISABEL HARRIS. London: Henry Frowde, 1904. Pp. xii + 466. \$2.40.

The tragedies of Seneca are of special interest to us, aside from their intrinsic value, for the triple reason that they are (with the exception of the *Octavia*) the sole representatives of Roman tragedy preserved entire, that they reflect the literary complexion of the artificial age in which they were produced, and that they had great influence in shaping the early English drama. They are, in fact, the stepping-stone between Greek and modern drama; for these tragedies, rather than the Greek plays, were the model for Italian, French, and early English tragedy. The principal reason for this was, no doubt, the fact that the Middle Age of Europe was an age of Latin rather than of Greek learning, and so Seneca was more accessible than the Greek dramatists. But it is also probable that his style and spirit appealed strongly to those later playwrights. The tragedies were especially popular in the early Elizabethan age, and a number of English translations of them appeared at that time. These different versions were collected in a single volume by Thomas Newton in 1585. The tragedies were again translated in 1761 by Glover.

Students of the development of the drama, and especially students of early English drama, have found these early translations hardly suitable for their purposes; and they will welcome this translation by Miss Harris as an invaluable help in their research.

Lack of space prevents any detailed comment upon the translation itself. Suffice it to say that the work has been done with great care, and that those who use the book may be assured that the translation is a trustworthy presentation of the original, so far as this can be said of any translation.

Both the dialogue and the lyric parts have been rendered into English blank verse. This represents very well the original *senarius*, but from the standpoint of literary form it is to be regretted that the choruses have not been translated into some corresponding lyric measures. If this had been done, a more faithful representation of Seneca would have been secured, and at the same time the monotony of the blank verse would have been broken. Such criticism of the book, however, is disarmed by the translator's own acknowledgement of this as the ideal form, and by her modest confession of hesitation in attempting the difficult task.

F. J. MILLER.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee. By FRIEDRICH BLASS. Halle: Niemeyer, 1904. Pp. 306.

The writer of this book has made an enviable reputation in many different lines of work, though he is perhaps best known as the author of *Die attische Beredsamkeit*. The present work gains much of its interest from the fact that it contains the judgment of a famous scholar upon the results that have been reached by critics in a field he has hitherto left untouched, the Homeric poems. The point of view is exceedingly conservative. Blass believes as little in the many-headed Homer as in the Lernaean Hydra. He asserts that it is time to apply to the criticism of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the same principles which we use in dealing with any other Greek or Latin writer. The *Odyssey* he believes to be in large part the work of one great poet; that is sufficiently proved by its unity. The inconsistencies in chronology are discussed, frankly granted, but set aside as proving nothing against the unity of authorship. The frequent repetitions, also, are accepted as characteristic of the Homeric style; no passage should be rejected on this ground, unless the context demands it.

About two-thirds of the volume is devoted to a discussion, book by book, of the interpolations due to rhapsodists, copyists, and others. In this section Blass rejects, as unsuited to the context or in conflict with Homeric ideas, 680 lines in all, made up for the most part of scattered passages of from one to five lines, longer passages being ix. 322-31; xv. 14-26, 74-85; and the description of the palace of Alcinous, vii. 103-31. As was to be expected, most of these

lines have been discussed before, but even the specialist in Homeric criticism may find some points worthy of his attention (cf. Hennings *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1905. 523). Among the longer interpolations by later poets he includes the loves of Ares and Aphrodite, viii. 266-369; that part of the visit to Hades which contains the catalogue of famous women, xi. 228-327, and of heroes not connected with the story of Troy, xi. 565-627; the passages referring to Theoclymenus, xv. 222-91, 508-49; xvii. 52-56, 61-166; xx. 347-89; the boar-hunt, xix. 394-466; the history of the bow, xxi. 15-41; xxiii. 111-76; and the last 624 lines of the poem. In all, 1,913 out of 10,197 lines are rejected. The opinions of the ancient critics are given much weight throughout.

It is unlikely that the opinions of Homeric scholars will be affected by the views of Blass upon the larger questions involved. The believer in an original *Nóeros* with later additions will still believe.

A. G. LAIRD.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

Essentials of Latin for Beginners. By H. C. PEARSON. New York: American Book Co. Pp. 316. \$0.90.

Of the seventy-six lessons of the book, the last six, containing the conditions, wishes, complex sentences in indirect discourse, impersonal verbs, supine and periphrastic conjugations, are called "supplementary," to be taken or omitted as the teacher sees fit. The exercises of each lesson are in two parts, one for review and the other to illustrate more particularly the new grammatical points and words of the lesson. There are also occasional tests for the review of nouns and verbs. According to the author's statement, the words used in the exercises proper number only five hundred; but the vocabulary at the end of the book is rather larger than that of most books of the kind, owing to the many additional words found in the supplementary reading-lessons.

The book is designed as a direct preparation for Caesar, and in certain respects, at least, the author never loses sight of his goal. The vocabulary is rigidly Caesarean, and the exercises are even more so. The latter hardly ever emerge from the capturing of towns, the fighting of battles, the pitching of camps, the hearing of shouts from those who were with the baggage, the failure of the grain supply, etc. Even within this narrow round certain words occur with extreme frequency, while others which are given in the vocabularies are used but little, and some, apparently, not at all. The sentences of the exercises are short and easy, toward the end of the book certainly too easy. It is evidently the author's intention to accustom the pupil to long sentences by the supplementary reading-lessons, of which there are ten in the body of the book and more at the end, nearly all adaptations of parts of Caesar. The contrast between the short sentences of the regular exercises and the long ones in these reading-lessons is striking enough, and it will not be hard for an experienced teacher to predict

what sort of a time the class will have with the latter. The gap is too great, not only in the length and complexity of the sentences, but also in the large number of new and often difficult words which these contain. A still further contrast between the regular exercises and the reading-lessons is due to a considerable lack of variety in the arrangement of words in the former, which is quite too regular to furnish a good preparation for the reading of an author. As a specific case in this line might be mentioned the almost invariable placing of the possessive adjective before the noun.

Some cases of suspicious Latin occur, as (p. 177) *Ubi ire mecum mavis?* where a note translates *ubi* by "when," and (p. 122) *Hic collis septuaginta quinque pedes est in altitudine*, a construction of which there are several other illustrations. On p. 133 we read, *Pompeius sex annis minor natu erat quam Caesar*.

The book contains some good pedagogical ideas and is attractive in appearance, but must be placed in a class with Collar and Daniell's *First Year Latin*, as another attempt to secure a preparation for the long, complex sentences of Caesar by the exclusive study of short and simple ones.

J. J. S.

A First Latin Writer. By MATHER A. ABBOTT. New York: American Book Co. Pp. 145. \$0.60.

This book contains thirty-seven lessons, intended for the second year of the high school, and a general vocabulary. It covers the ordinary case and mood constructions, and is divided into three parts, of thirteen, twelve, and twelve lessons, two lessons at the end of each part being devoted to a review of that term's work. The vocabulary and illustrative examples are taken largely from the second book of Caesar. Each lesson deals with one or more constructions or a group of constructions, and consists of (a) grammatical questions with their answers, and English and Latin sentences illustrating the points discussed; (b) passages from the second book of Caesar, first in translation, then in Latin, in which the pupil is asked to point out the constructions just treated; (c) a vocabulary, and (d) sentences to be translated into Latin.

The idea of basing a systematic set of exercises for the second year on a selected Caesar vocabulary is a good one, and the book has good points, as, for example, its reviews. But such a book ought to take account of the first year's work, and ought to be based upon that more directly than this one is. The pupil may certainly be expected to know some of the simpler uses of the cases and of the verb when he enters the second year, and it would hardly seem necessary to have notes like "Into one place, *in unum locum*. *In* with the accusative." On the other hand, the pupil is, in the nature of the case, not well grounded as yet in some of the more difficult forms, such as the irregular verbs, pronouns, comparison, etc. Some of the time of the second year could [not be more

profitably spent than in a further systematic treatment and review of these matters. The sentences for translation should, on the whole, be briefer. Six to eight lines is a useless length for any stage of high-school work.

The catechetical method of grammar instruction makes an odd impression on one at this day, but we might pardon it if the author had been more careful to slough off some of his classroom habits. It does not suit everyone to have his pupils learn grammatical terms like "infinitive with subject accusative construction" and "indirect question construction," or to read that "the hortatory subjunctive is a main clause used to denote, etc.," or to have "repeated action" and "completed action" (or even "complete time") spoken of constantly as if they were an exhaustive list of the possible tense-spheres.

Mistakes or misleading statements occur here and there. *Fines*, -um is misleading; *a mile* is not *milia passuum*, and *his army was conquered* is not *suus exercitus est victus*.

The author grudgingly "yields so far to present usage as to follow the old rule of marking long vowels in the penults and ultimas, and those only." "Hidden quantity" he has, as he says, altogether disregarded, i. e., has not marked the vowels before two consonants at all. The question of vowel-marking in an elementary Latin book is no longer an open one. But if one wishes to regard it so, he is in duty bound to choose between marking and not marking. The practice here adopted might be serviceable, if it were general, but, as things are, it is merely confusing.

There is not enough difference between the type of the exercises and that of the grammatical discussion, and the latter has a ragged and scattered appearance not inviting to the eye.

J. J. S.

Preparatory Latin Writer. By CHARLES E. BENNETT. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1905. Pp. 194. \$0.80.

The widespread and favorable recognition accorded to the same author's *Latin Composition*, published in 1896, to which the present book forms a companion volume, makes a lengthy notice of the *Latin Writer* unnecessary. The general plan of both books is the same. The number of lessons (forty-four), the order in which the constructions are treated (following strictly that of the author's Latin grammar), the grammatical references (to Bennett, Allen and Greenough, and Harkness—to the latest editions of the last two), the illustrative examples (adapted from Roman authors) and the remarks thereon, are identical in the two books. In the new book, however, the English sentences for translation into Latin are based upon Caesar and not, as in the *Latin Composition*, upon Cicero. The sentences are of about the same difficulty and exhibit the various constructions under treatment in about the same variety of forms. The author has met the demand for passages of "continuous prose"

by providing forty such exercises—about twenty-five more than the older book contains. The book is marked by the same accuracy of statement that characterizes the author's other works. There is much to praise and little to criticize. We might, however, have expected the remark on p. 56 to have been worded somewhat differently in view of the conclusions reached by George V. Edwards in his work on the *Ablative of Quality and the Genitive of Quality* (New York, 1900); and since the phrase *multi ex se* rarely, if ever, occurs in classical prose it would probably best be omitted on p. 72. All in all, the book deserves to be highly recommended to teachers of Latin in secondary schools, who prefer the time-honored method of instruction in Latin composition, so well exemplified in this book and in that of Elisha Jones.

CLARENCE L. MEADER.

ANN ARBOR.

Latin Exercise Book. By A. I. DOTEY. New York: University Publishing Co. Part I, \$0.25; parts II, III, IV, \$0.20 each.

This series of notebooks, four in number, one for each of the first four books of Caesar's *Gallie War*, aims in the first place, according to the prefatory note, to guide the pupil in the preparation of his lesson, and in the second, to assist the teacher in securing definite recitations and systematic reviews. It consists of very helpful "Suggestive Questions and Notes" on each chapter, intended either to give the student direct assistance, or to call his attention by judicious questions to matters of importance to be found in his text or notes; of "Grammatical References" to be provided by the pupil for usually about thirty points of syntax taken from the chapter; of a blank column headed "Vocabulary," in which the pupil is to make a list of all new words and their meanings, and another column for additional notes taken in class. Last of all, there is a space, appropriately headed, for the inflection of some Latin word, to be written during the recitation period.

Aside from the practical difficulties which would suggest themselves to any teacher of Caesar in considering this plan, one cannot but think of the enormous amount of labor involved on the part of both teacher and pupil in operating with any degree of exactness a system of notebooks so elaborate as this. Yet when the great need, at that critical period, of some means of making both requirements and results more definite is considered, it seems ungrateful to criticize a plan so conscientiously worked out as this. The value of any such pedagogical device is, after all, in its suggestiveness; and while perhaps no teacher of any individuality would care to adopt this system of notes without modification, it might be used to advantage by almost any teacher.

J. RALEIGH NELSON.

LEWIS INSTITUTE,
Chicago.

New Literature

BOOKS

BROWNE, HENRY. *Handbook of Homeric Study*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1905. Pp. xvi+333; 22 plates. \$2.

Deals in a general way with some of the more important phases of the Homeric question, e. g., the date and authorship of the poems; the nature and history of their dialect; the relation of the Homeric to prehistoric, oriental, and Hellenic civilization, Homeric life and religion; the epic art of Homer, and so forth.

BURTON, HARRY EDWIN. *Selections from Livy, with Notes and Introduction*. New York: American Book Co., 1905. Pp. 375; 6 maps.

Intended for the use of college students. The selections, which range from one to eleven chapters in length, are taken from twenty different books.

GARDNER, PERCY. *A Grammar of Greek Art*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1905. Pp. xii+267; 87 illustrations.

Some of the subjects treated are the "General Character of Greek Art," "Architecture," "Sculpture," "Vases," "Literature and Painting." The book is intended especially for classical teachers in schools.

MATHER, MAURICE W. *Caesar: Episodes from the Gallic and Civil Wars. With Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary*. New York: American Book Co., 1905. Pp. 549; illustrations, maps, and plans. \$1.25.

Gives some of the most important parts of both the *Gallic* and the *Civil War*. The selections from the *Gallic War* are equivalent in amount to the first four books. From the *Civil War* about two-thirds as much is taken.

MARX, FR. *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*. Vol. II. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1905. Pp. 437. M. 14.

This, the second volume of Marx's great edition of Lucilius, contains the commentary on the 1,378

verses or fragments which he accepts as Lucilian. The work marks an epoch in the study of Lucilius.

PLESSIS, FRÉDÉRIC. *Poésie latine, épitaphes, textes choisis et commentaires publiés avec le concours de six élèves*. Paris: Fontemoing, 1905.

In this little book we have a new and interesting departure. The epigraphical material is treated as so much literature. Each one of the epigraphical poems selected (there are sixty-seven in all) is analyzed and commented on just as if it were a poem of Catullus or an ode of Horace.

POHL, RUDOLFUS. *De Graecorum Medicis Publicis*. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1905. Pp. 86. M. 1.80.

A carefully written dissertation in which all the available evidence relating to public physicians in Greece has been collected and discussed.

ROSTOWZEW, M. *Römische Bleitesserae: Ein Beitrag zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1905. Pp. xi+131. M. 7.

A valuable treatise on the different kinds of lead tokens in use among the Romans. It is a briefer German edition of the author's Russian publication on the same subject.

SCHANZ, M. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. III. Teil: Die Zeit von Hadrian 117 bis auf Constantin 324. 2. Aufl. (Handbuch der klass. Alt. hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller VIII. iii.) München: C. H. Beck, 1905.

The first edition of this volume was published in 1896 and contained 410 pages. This edition has 512. The whole volume has been revised and the results of the investigations of recent years incorporated in it. It is the labor involved in new editions of parts already published that has prevented Professor Schanz from finishing his work. There is still one volume to come.

STEUP, J. Thukydides, erklärt von J. Classen. Bd. VI (Buch VI); 3. Aufl. Berlin: Weidmann, 1905. Pp. iv+295; 2 maps. M. 3.

A new volume of the revised edition of Classen's work, which does not, however, show much use of the literature that has appeared since Classen's time.

WALTERS, H. B. History of Ancient Pottery, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman. Based on the work of Samuel Birch. Two volumes. New York: Charles

Scribner's Sons, 1905. Pp. xxv+504; xiv+558. Illustrated.

An important and much-needed work. Although based upon Birch's well-known history, it is, in many respects, independent of it. It does not include as many different kinds of pottery (all that is not Greek or Graeco-Italic is omitted) but is almost twice as large as the earlier work. This is due not so much to a more voluminous treatment as to the very great advance made in this subject in the last thirty years. Seventeen chapters in the two volumes are devoted to Greek vases and their decoration, one to Etruscan and South Italian work, and five to Roman pottery, i. e., pottery produced in Italy while under Roman rule.

ARTICLES

BONNER, CAMPBELL. The Use of Apostrophe in Homer. *Classical Review* XIX (1905). 383-86.

The writer concludes that metrical considerations furnished the occasion for the apostrophe in a majority of the cases in Homer. In some instances, however, there is no metrical exigency to be reckoned with, and the apostrophe has distinct rhetorical value; in other examples metrical and rhetorical considerations co-operate.

ELMORE, J. A Note on Horace *Sat.* 6. 126. *Classical Review* XIX (1905). 8. 400, 401.

A new explanation of the reading of *V fugio campum lusumque trigonem*. Mr. Elmore thinks that in *lusum trigonem* we have an example of the use of the perfect participle to express the leading idea of a phrase. The meaning, then, is not the "game of ball" (where *lusum=ludum*), nor the "ball game I have already played," but the "playing of the ball game"—"I leave behind me the campus and the ball-playing."

ENDT, JOHANN. Der Gebrauch der Apostrophe bei den lateinischen Epikern.

Wiener Studien XXVII (1905). 106-29.

After commenting on some examples of apostrophe in Homer, Endt deals with the use of the figure in Virgil, Lucan, Silius Italicus, and other Roman poets. He protests against the promiscuous application of the *metri causa* argument in both the Greek and the Latin examples. His analysis shows the rhetorical intent of the figure in a considerable number of passages.

GARDNER, P. The Apoxyomenos of Lysippus. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* XXV (1905). 234-59.

Professor Gardner attacks the position, commonly held by archaeologists, that the Apoxyomenos of the Vatican faithfully reproduces a lost work of Lysippus and may be considered in all its details as an index of his style. He thinks that it is a copy of a work of one of Lysippus' pupils, or of someone belonging to his school, who worked in the third century.

JACOBY, F. Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie. *Rheinisches Museum* LX (1905). 38-105.

The writer attacks the theory of F. Leo that the Roman subjective erotic elegy was of Hellenistic origin. He acknowledges that Roman elegy was influenced by the form of Hellenistic elegy, and that a great deal of illustrative mythological material of an erotic character was derived from that source, but takes the position that there is no evidence that Hellenistic elegy ever was subjective. While believing in several contributing influences, he is inclined to think that the subjective erotic elegy was very largely the creation of Cornelius Gallus and his followers, of whom Propertius was the most important.

SOGLIANO, A. Pompei—Relazione degli scavi fatti dal dicembre 1902 a tutto marzo 1905. *Notizie degli Scavi* 1905, fascicolo 4.

This article contains a belated description of the house (Reg. V. Ins. iv. N:13) in which the fresco depicting scenes connected with the foundation of Rome was found three years ago. The value of the painting was first pointed out by Professor Pais, who published a photograph of it in the *New York Century*, and who has reproduced it in his recent book, *Ancient Legends of Roman History*.